UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,580	03/10/2004	Arnold Blinn	MS#304543.01 (5101)	6335

38779   7590   07/29/2008
SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT)
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, 16TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER
SHAIFER HARRIMAN, DANT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/29/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>09 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 - 15 & 19, 20, 23, 30, 32, 33 - 38</u>.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

   _____.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☒ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.

/Kambiz Zand/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicants arguments/remarks have been fully considered, but fail to place to overcome the 35 USC 103a rejection on the above caims.

Examiners response to applicants arguments/remarks:

Applicant states: "And, even if Xia discloses authentication to a client is optional, none of the cited references (Xia, Venkataramappa, Zhang and Stanko) disclose "storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein authentication of the user by the first service is optional" and "in response to the authentication of the user by the second request, the user is authenticated for the first service as a result of the stored first data" as recited in the claim 1. "

---The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraph: 0036 of Xia, the examiner notes that the "storing of the first data on the client (i.e. user device) in response to the received first request," is equated with the management server sending the token to the user device, then the examiner equates, "said first data identifying the first service wherein authentication of the user by the first service is optional," as the user either being authorized by the management server or not authorized by the management server, the examiner chooses that the user be authenticated by the management server, with this said, the proxy server authenticated the user device by validating the token that was stored on the user device by checking with the management server.

Applicant states: "However, in this rejection, neither the element of storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifvin the first service ... nor the result of in response to the authentication of the user by the second request, the user is authenticated for the first service as a result of the stored first data is found in the combined art. "

--The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraph: 0036 of Xia, the examiner notes that the "storing of the first data on the client (i.e. user device) in response to the received first request," is equated with the management server sending the token to the user device, then the examiner equates, "said first data identifying the first service wherein authentication of the user by the first service is optional," as the user either being authorized by the management server or not authorized by the management server, the examiner chooses that the user be authenticated by the management server, with this said, the proxy server authenticated the user device by validating the token that was stored on the user device by checking with the management server.

Applicant states: "For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or make obvious each and every element of claim 1. ".

--The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to the examiner previous logic and reasoning above.

Applicant states: "However, in this rejection, neither the element of storing first data on the client in response to allowing the user access to the first service, said first data identifving a first policy group associated with the first service, nor the result of if the second service is associated with the first policy group identified by the stored first data, allowing the user access to the second service in response to the received second request wherein the user is authenticated for the second service in response to the received second request is found in the combined art. "

--The examiner disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraphs: 0030 & 0034 & 0036 of Xia, the examiner notes that the "storing of the first data on the client (i.e. user device) in response to the received first request," is equated with the management server sending the token to the user device, then the examiner equates, "said first data identifying the first service wherein authentication of the user by the first service is optional," as the user either being authorized by the management server or not authorized by the management server, the examiner chooses that the user be authorized by the management server, with this said, the proxy server authenticated the user device by validating the token that was stored on the user device by checking with the management server, and any associated policies or permission from the directory server/access control # 114 by the management server # 110.

Applicant states: "For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or make obvious each and every element of claim 15. "

--The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to the examiner previous logic and reasoning above.